



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/630,659	08/01/2000	Takeshi Misawa	1982-0155P	6231

7590 08/12/2004

Birch Stewart Kolasch & Birch LLP
PO Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LUONG TRUNG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2612

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/630,659

Applicant(s)

MISAWA, TAKESHI

Examiner

LUONG T NGUYEN

Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8,13,17 and 21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-12,14-16 and 18-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 August 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election of Species I, illustrated in Figs. 1A-8B and 15, which reads on claims 1-7, 9-12, 14-20 in the reply filed on 5/17/2004 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
2. Claims 8, 13 and 21 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected Species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 5/17/2004.
3. Claim 17 is withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner because claim 17 recites the limitation "a second display device" and "the step of displaying range information includes displaying the main image on one display device and the sub-image on the other display device," which read on Figure 9B (Species II). Species II is a non-elected Species. Therefore, claim 17 is withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 1-7, 9-12, 14-16, 18-20 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1 (line 5), claim 12 (line 10), "the panel" should be changed to --the display panel--.

Claim 1 (line 7), claim 12 (line 12), "the display control device" should be changed

Art Unit: 2612

to --the display device--.

Claim 1 (lines 11-12), claim 5 (line 2), claim 12 (lines 16-17), "the display device panel" should be changed to --the display panel--.

Claim 1 (line 13), claim 14 (line 8), claim 20 (line 9), "the entire image" should be changed to --an entire image--.

Claim 4 (line 2), "control device display" should be changed to --device--.

Claim 20 (line 14), "said photographic device" should be changed to --said photography device--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamamura et al. (US 6,567,120) in view of Tanaka (US 5,253,338).

Regarding claim 1, Hamamura et al. discloses an image display apparatus, comprising a memory device for electronic and retrieval information (frame memory 35, figure 6, column 9, lines 1-5); a display device (LCD 6, figure 6, column 9, lines 1-5); a display control device having electronic program logic for causing the display control device to retrieve the stored

Art Unit: 2612

information and display the image represented by the stored information is inherently included in the device to display the image.

Hamamura et al. fails to specifically disclose the display control device displays a portion of the image represented by the stored information as a main image on the display panel and range information indicating the portion of the image displayed in relation to an entire image represented by the stored information. However, Tanaka discloses a semi-automatic image tracing method for a graphics processing device, which discloses displaying a portion of the image represented by the stored information as a main image on the display panel as the auxiliary view port 46 displayed on display screen 40, figure 5; and discloses range information as window 44, figure 5, column 7, lines 45-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Hamamura et al. by the teaching Tanaka in order to enlarge and display a portion of the displayed image. This allows the user easily to recognize a desired portion of displayed image.

Regarding claim 2, Hamamura et al. discloses the image information outputted from a photography device (CCD 20, figure 6), the photography device produces the image information from optical information (lens 3, figure 6).

Regarding claim 3, Hamamura et al. discloses the stored image information in said memory device is image information acquired by communication with another device (memory card 24, figure 6, column 6, lines 19-34, column 9, lines 1-5).

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding claim 5, Tanaka discloses a sub-image superposed over a section of the main image (figure 5).

Regarding claim 6, Tanaka discloses a border around the sub-image (window 44, figure 5).

Regarding claim 7, Hamamura et al. and Tanaka do not disclose the display control device displays the sub-image having at least one of saturation, lightness, and hue range different from that of the main image. However, Tanaka discloses the auxiliary view port 46 superposed on image 42. It would have been obvious to have the hue range of these two images different from each other in order to allow the user easily recognizes a desired portion.

Regarding claim 9, Tanaka discloses a designation device (designation input device 12, figure 1, column 5, lines 20-26), a magnification size (enlarge, column 5, lines 20-26).

Regarding claim 10, Hamamura et al. discloses the stored information was read from an information medium (memory card 24) and stored in said memory device (frame memory 35, figure 6, column 6, lines 27-32).

As for claim 12, all the limitation is contained in claims 1-2. Therefore, see Examiner's comment regarding claims 1-2.

Art Unit: 2612

Claims 14, 18, 19 are method claims of apparatus claims 1, 9, 10, respectively.

Therefore, see Examiner's comment regarding claims 1, 9, 10, respectively.

Regarding claim 16, Tanaka discloses displaying the range information as a sub-image, which is smaller than the main image (figure 5).

As for claim 20, all the limitation is contained in claims 1-3. Therefore, see Examiner's comment regarding claims 1-3.

7. Claims 4, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamamura et al. (US 6,567,120) in view of Tanaka (US 5,253,338) further in view of Chiba et al. (US 5,589,960).

Regarding claims 4 and 15, Hamamura et al. and Tanaka fail to specifically disclose the display device comprises a transmission type dot matrix display. However, Chiba et al. discloses a liquid crystal display system, in which a dot-matrix type transmission liquid crystal display device is employed as a display means in the head-up display system (column 1, lines 15-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Hamamura et al. and Tanaka by the teaching of Chiba et al. in order to provide a display sufficiently high in contrast (column 1, lines 30-34).

8. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamamura et al. (US 6,567,120) in view of Tanaka (US 5,253,338) further in view of Ejima (US 2002/0024608).

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding claim 11, Hamamura et al. and Tanaka fail to specifically disclose an index image in which a plurality of images are arranged in matrix format, and said electronic program logic displays as said main image, any one image of the plurality of images. However, Ejima et al. discloses an information processing apparatus, which forms the plurality of index images as shown in figures 12, 14, and can display a selected image as shown in figures 16(A)-16(D). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Hamamura et al. and Tanaka by the teaching of Ejima et al. in order to display a plurality of images on the display. This allows a user can view and select a desired image to be enlarged.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Suzuki et al. (US 5,191,441) discloses an image reading device.

Anderson (US 5,557,667) discloses method and apparatus for capturing a multidimensional array of overlapping images for composite image generation.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LUONG T NGUYEN whose telephone number is (703) 308-9297. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM - 5:00PM.

Art Unit: 2612

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber can be reached on (703) 305-4929. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LN LN
8/8/04


TUAN HO
PRIMARY EXAMINER